

MINUTES

CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE (CTCDC) MEETING

Sacramento, July 28, 2005

The second CTCDC meeting of year 2005 was held in Sacramento, on July 28, 2005.

Chairman John Fisher opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. with the introduction of Committee Members and guests. Chairman Fisher thanked Caltrans for hosting the meeting. The following Members, alternates and guests were in attendance:

<u>ATTENDANCE</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>TELEPHONE</u>
Members (Voting)		
John Fisher Chairman	League of CA Cities City of Los Angeles	(213) 972-8424
Farhad Mansourian Vice Chairman	CA State Association of Counties Marin County	(415) 499-6570
Gerry Meis	Caltrans	(916) 654-4551
Lenley Duncan	CHP	(916) 657-7222
Ed von Borstel	League of CA Cities City of Modesto	(209) 577-5266
Merry Banks	California State Automobile Association	(415) 241-8904
Jacob Babico	CA State Association of Counties San Bernardino County	(909) 387-8186
Hamid Bahadori	Auto Club of Southern California	(714) 885-2326
<u>ALTERNATES</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>TELEPHONE</u>
Gain Aggarwal	League of CA Cities City of Vacaville	(707) 449-5349

ATTENDEES

ORGANIZATION

TELEPHONE/E-Mail

Matt Schmitz
Kent Milton
Bret Goss
Steve Ainsworth
Chad Dornsife

FHWA
CHP Head Quarter
FCF Inc.
City of Lincoln
Highway Safety Group

matthew.schmitz@fhwa.dot.gov
Kmilton@CHP.CA.GOV
Bret@FirstCallFlagging.com
SAINSWORTH@MHMENGR.co
cdornsife@highwaysafety.us
(858) 673-1926

Richard Haggstorm

Caltrans

richard_haggstorm@dot.ca.gov
(916) 654-6600

Walter Laabs
Keith Lee
Dwight Ku
Joe Jeffrey

City of Santa Rosa
LA County, DPW
CSAA
Road-Tech Safety

wlaabs@srcity.org
klee@ladpw.org
DWIGHT-KU@CSAA.com
joe@roadtech.com
(530) 676-7797

Don Howe
Ken Kochevar

Caltrans
FHWA

dhowe@dot.ca.gov
KenKochevar@fhwa.dot.gov
(916) 498-5853

Nancy Dean

National Weather Service

nancy.dean@noaa.gov
(707) 443-5610 x222

Barb Alberson
Ginny Mecham
Meriko Hoshida
Roger M. Bazeley
Craig A. Copelan
Carl Walker
Jesse Bhullar
Ricardo Olea
Bond M. Yee
Robert Anderson
Ken Coleman

Co Dept. of Health Services
CHP
CHP
SF PTA
Caltrans
City of Lincoln
Caltrans
City of San Francisco

barberso@dhs.ca.gov
Gmecham@chp.ca.gov
mhoshida@chp.ca.gov
GAZeleg@designstrategy-usa.com
craig.copelen@dot.ca.gov
cwalker@ci.lincn.ca.us
jesse-bhullar@dot.ca.gov
ricardo.olea@sfgov.org
bond.yee@sfgov.org
anderson@stateseismic.com
colemank@metro.net
(213) 922-2951

Ahmad Rastegarpour
Dennis Anderson
Tedi Jackson

CT
3M
CSD

ahmud_rastegarpour@dot.ca.gov
d-anderson@mmm.com
Tjackson@sandiego.gov
(619) 527-3121

Mark Stone
Kevin Taber

City of San Diego
County of Placer

mstone@sandiego.gov
ktaber@placer.ca.gov

MINUTES

Adoption of March 25, 2005 CTCDC meeting minutes.

Motion: Moved by Farhad Mansourian, seconded by Ed von Borstel, to adopt the Minutes of March 25, 2005 CTCDC meeting held in San Diego, California. Motion carried 8-0.

Membership:

Chairman Fisher presented a plaque to Mr. Dwight Ku who has resigned from the CTCDC due to his new assignment within the California State Automobile Association of Northern California. He thanked Dwight for his contribution to the profession of traffic engineering to promote uniformity in the traffic control devices for the State of California.

Note: Due to technical difficulties, the CTCDC proceedings were not recorded for the first two hours. I have summarized minutes from my notes. If I have missed any comments, please advise.

Public Comments:

Chairman Fisher asked for public comments on any item not appearing on the agenda.

Walter Laabs, Interim Deputy Director of Public Works, City of Santa Rosa, stated that the speed survey guidelines adopted during the adoption of the MUTCD 2003 along with the CA supplement does not provide clarity to the practitioner. It states that the speed limit should be established at the nearest 10 km/h (5-mph) increment to the 85th percentile speed. However, in matching the existing conditions with traffic safety needs of the community, engineering judgement may indicate the need for a further reduction of 10km (5 mph). The Traffic Manual, page 8-8 of the January 1996 revision, states the speed limit normally should be established at the first five mile per hour increment below the 85th percentile speed. He suggested that Caltrans should change the language regarding engineering and traffic surveys contained into the MUTCD and CA Supplement to be consistent with language contained in the old Traffic Manual.

Chad Dornsife stated that the guidelines in the CA supplement and MUTCD 2003 are not clear to the practitioner. He mentioned to the committee that he has published a paper on how to establish a speed limit on a roadway, then asked the committee to review it and see if by adopting it, it would provide more clarity. He further added that the MUTCD 2003 or CA supplement contains guidelines about how to measure an approach speed, to set up advance loop detectors, and yellow timing for signalized intersections.

Chairman Fisher asked Chad to provide his paper to the committee for review. Chairman Fisher also asked Walter Laabs to submit a written request outlining his concerns in regards to the speed survey.

Committee Members Jacob Babico and Hamid Bahadori suggested placing the speed survey item on the next Committee agenda as a discussion item.

Roger Bazeley, PTA, San Francisco, talked about school signing in general and asked the committee to consider bigger, more retroreflectrized school signs and better markings in school zones.

05-2 Proposal to Amend MUTCD Section 1A.03

Chairman Fisher asked Gerry Meis to present item 05-2, "Proposal to amend MUTCD Section 1A.03".

Gerry Meis stated that during the adoption of the MUTCD 2003 along with the CA Supplement, Section 1A.03 of MUTCD 2003 was adopted in California, which allows agencies having jurisdiction over highways to develop verbal message signs. This is in conflict with the California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 21400. In California CVC Section 21400 authorizes only the Department of Transportation to develop standards and specifications for official traffic control devices after consulting with local agencies in an open public hearing. He pointed out that there is draft language included in the agenda packet to amend this section. The draft is as follows:

Section 1A.03 Design of Traffic Control Devices

Standard:

Except as noted in the Option below, highway agencies shall not develop word message signs. In accordance with CVC Section 21401, only word message signs conforming to Department of Transportation standards and specifications shall be placed on streets and highways.

Option:

~~Highway agencies may develop word message signs to notify road users of special regulations or to warn road users of a situation that might not be readily apparent. Unlike symbol signs and colors, new word message signs may be used without the need for experimentation.~~ ***Highway agencies may develop place/facility name or day, date, time portion of the word message on signs to notify road users of special regulations or to warn road users of a situation that might not be readily apparent. Unlike symbol signs and colors, these place/facility name or day, date, time modified word message signs may be used without the need for experimentation.*** With the exception of symbols and colors, minor modifications in the specific design elements of a device may be made provided the essential appearance characteristics are preserved. Although the standard design of symbol signs cannot be modified, it may be appropriate to change the orientation of the symbol to better reflect the direction of travel.

Chairman Fisher opened discussion amongst the Committee members.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he has one concern with the draft language, the words "special regulations" used under "Option", which will allow local agencies to develop any regulatory sign, and that the purpose to amend Section 1A.03 would not be achieved. However, he agreed with the proposal.

Farhad Mansourian suggested changing the words from, "special regulations" to "special events/circumstances".

Chairman Fisher asked for any other comments from the Committee members and audiences.

There were none.

Motion: Moved by Farhad Mansourian, seconded by Merry Banks, recommended adopting the language as proposed in the agenda packet, with the change under Option from "regulations" to "events/circumstances".

Chairman Fisher opened discussion on the motion.

Gian Aggarwal asked why there is an option to allow agencies to add date, day, and time on the signs.

Chairman Fisher responded that allowing the addition of date, day and time would accommodate the need of a local agency, such as when they want to close a roadway or prohibit certain movements.

Roger Bazeley stated that he agreed with the proposal and supported the motion.

There were no other comments.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Item completed and it will be incorporated in the CA Supplement.

05-3 Parking Restrictions at Intersections (CA Supplement Section 3b.18)

Chairman Fisher asked Gerry Meis to introduce item 05-3, "Parking Restrictions at Intersections".

Gerry Meis briefed the Committee and audience that the Traffic Manual on parking restrictions at intersections has two different policies under two different sections, as follows:

Chapter 6, Section 6-02.13 Parking Stall Markings

Fourth paragraph of this section states: All intersections, one stall length on each side measured from the crosswalk or end of curb return should have parking prohibited.

Chapter 8, Section 8.02-2 Policy on Parking Restrictions

Item C, fourth paragraph states: All intersections, one stall length on each side from the crosswalk or end or curb return shall have parking prohibited.

Gerry further stated that as the committee is aware, San Francisco is concerned with the "shall" condition that has been officially adopted with the 2003 California Supplement. Gerry also shared a letter written by Mr. James R. Helmer, Director of Transportation, City of San Jose. The City of San Jose also supports the "should" conditions instead of the "shall" condition. Gerry introduced Mr. Bond M Yee, Executive Director Department of Parking and Traffic, City and County of San Francisco and requested him to address the Committee.

Bond Yee stated that he representing the City of San Francisco due to concerns about the existing language in the CA Supplement Section 3B.18 concerning parking restrictions at intersections. Section 3B.18 reads as follows:

"All inetrsections, one stall length on each side measured from the crosswalk or end of the curb return shall have parking prohibited. A clearance of 1.8 m (6 ft) measured from the curb return shall be provided at alleys and driveways."

Bond Yee stated that prior to the adoption of the MUTCD, the Traffic Manual has a "should" condition in Section 6 and a "shall" condition in Section 8 for these regulations. San Francisco relies heavily on its on-street parking supply both in residential and commercial areas. The densely built environment makes every parking space valuable, thus forcing our traffic engineers to exercise extra care whenever parking is removed. The City has around seven thousand intersections and our staff estimated that if this section were to be implemented in San Francisco we would have to eliminate over 40,000 spaces, of which over 2,000 may be metered. The City's concerns here today should be seen in the context of a city where every parking removal being required would have to be approved at public hearings, with no guarantee of success. He stated that he is doubtful the City can ever fully comply with this regulation, given the political constraints, when it comes to on-street parking removals.

Bond Yee stated that they do not have disagreements with the general engineering guidelines that suggests prohibiting parking at intersections may be beneficial in certain circumstances. It should be noted however, that many of the references that are cited, such as those by AASHTO or ITE, speak in terms of these features being "desirable" or "should" conditions, not as absolutes. He asked that the Committee consider changing the requirements in the Supplement to a general guidance that allows room for local discretion. A possible substitute would be:

Guidance

“At intersections, parking may be prohibited on near-side and far-side approaches to provide additional turning clearance or to improve sight distance.”

The City believes the following to be some reasons why revisions to the present text are necessary:

1. He added that the MUTCD does not have language requiring parking prohibitions at intersections. Scott Wainwright of the FHWA wrote to the City on July 20, 2005 to explain that the MUTCD diagram on Section 3B.18 was only meant to be in compliance with the Uniform Vehicle Code, which California has not adopted but many other states have. It does not appear that the FHWA meant for this restriction to become a national requirement. Otherwise, it would have written specific “shall” language outlining its proposal ruling.
2. It is not clear what the benefits are of prohibiting parking on all departure legs of an intersection. These parking prohibitions may at times help large turning trucks, but this can be best determined on a case by case basis. There may be wide or one-way streets where the parking prohibition does not provide significant advantages, such as low volume residential streets where truck volumes are low. Requiring a parking space removal with no exceptions is in our opinion too strict.
3. Parking prohibitions approaching an intersection can provide improved sight distances but these are typically more beneficial for uncontrolled or two-way STOP approaches. The current Supplement language does not make this distinction, however, San Francisco does at times prohibit parking to improve sight distance but the actual distance used may be larger or smaller than a car length depending on field conditions and collision history. In San Francisco shorter red zones may be preferable at times since larger red zones tend to be easier to violate where demand is high.
4. Parking prohibitions approaching an intersection can make traffic controls more visible, but again this is a variable benefit that has to be balanced with the negative consequences of removing parking. In San Francisco, all STOP signs are supplemented with STOP pavement messages. The City has found this to be a more effective way to make these controls more prominent. In many situations the net visibility enhancements of prohibiting parking at the intersection are marginal at signalized or all-way STOP sign controlled intersections.
5. The requirement to prohibit parking at all alleys and driveways 6 feet from a curb return would be particularly difficult to implement. In fact, this regulation is so burdensome that we assume it must only apply to limited circumstances that are not explicitly outlined in the Supplement text. Again, it is not clear why the six feet criteria has to be a “shall” condition, and in this case even a “should” condition seems excessive given the number of private driveways in the state.
6. A requirement to prohibit parking at all intersections without exceptions places a liability burden on municipalities such as ours that may not be able to fully comply. It also requires a large degree of maintenance to paint or sign for no parking all eight parking spaces for every typical four-leg intersection in the state. The city alone has some 7,000 intersections. In areas where parking is limited, it would be a regulation that would become difficult to enforce, particularly at night.

There has been some discussion that, given the context in which 3B.18 appears, these regulations may only apply to situations with painted stall markings. This, however, does not seem logical, as there is nothing inherent in the use of stall markings that changes the characteristics of a roadway. The arguments in favor or against parking prohibitions at intersections should apply to all parking configurations whether

they are marked or not. Even if the Committee were to limit 3B.18's regulation only to stall markings, we would request that the text be revised to make it an optional guidance.

Finally, if the Committee still recommends parking restrictions be implemented at all approaches to an intersection, the City would have to ask that this regulation be adopted in the California Vehicle Code. The City believes that a regulatory issue of this magnitude should be debated by the legislature and, if approved, incorporated into the CVC, as has been done in other states. Placing these regulations in the Vehicle Code would aid in implementation, education and enforcement by giving them the force of state law rather than engineering design principles.

Chairman Fisher asked Committee members if they have any questions for Bond Yee.

Gerry Meis thanked Bond Yee for the detail comments.

Merry Banks suggested changing the wording from "shall" to "should."

Farhad Mansourian suggested that the parking restrictions should be left to the local jurisdiction to handle.

Hamid Bahadori stated that adoption of the "shall" conditions was a failure to notice inconsistency in the Traffic Manual.

Gerry Meis stated that the MUTCD 2003 is silent on this issue and he suggested removing "Standards" from Section 3B.18 (related to parking prohibition) from the California Supplement.

Chairman Fisher stated that in his opinion the "shall" condition applies where the parking slots are marked on a roadway, it does not apply where there are no parking slots marked.

Bond Yee disagreed and stated that the parking restrictions as outlined in the California Supplement are not tied to the marked slots. He further added that all intersections should be treated the same whether the parking slots are marked or not marked.

Chairman Fisher asked for comments from the public.

Chad Dornsife stated that each intersection must have a safer corner sight distance.

Roger Bazeley supported Bond Yee comments.

Chairman Fisher asked for other comments from the Committee members and the audience.

Gerry Meis stated that in his opinion this is not a traffic control device, therefore, the Committee considers deleting this section from the California Supplement.

Chairman Fisher stated that the language was transferred from the old Traffic Manual to the California Supplement.

There were no other comments.

Motion: Moved by Farhad Mansourian, seconded by Merry Banks, to change the word "shall" to "should" so that the section reads as follows:

“All intersections, one stall length on each side measured from the crosswalk or end of the curb return should have parking prohibited. A clearance of 1.8 m (6 ft) measured from the curb return should be provided at alleys and driveways.”

Motion carried 6-2 (Gerry Meis and John Fisher abstained).

Action: Item is completed.

05-4 Older California Traffic Safety Task Force Proposal (OCTSTF)

Chairman Fisher asked Gerry Meis to introduce item 05-4 that pertains to the older traffic safety task force to amend the MUTCD California Supplement sections regarding a variety of temporary traffic control devices.

Gerry introduced Ken Kochevar of FHWA and asked him to present the OCTSTF proposal to the Committee.

Ken Kochevar, FHWA, stated that he is a member of the Older California Traffic Safety Task Force (OCTSTF). The OCTSTF is to improve the safety and mobility for older drivers and pedestrians. The Task Force (TF) went through the handbook published by the FHWA on older motorists and pedestrians and identified 36 recommendations that were going to be prioritize and brought to the Committee to see if there is the possibility of incorporating those into the California Supplement. The TF first developed criteria for selecting these items and there are 8 criteria that the group came up with. The TF did not just randomly say that this is how we are going to prioritize these. Item 05-4 contains various sub items and they all related to Part 6, Temporary Traffic Control. The data shows that older drivers show reduced sensitivity to contrast. Older drivers also have difficulty processing information due to less effective scanning behavior and eye movements, diminished visual field size, difficulty in selective attention, and slower decision making. Second, all the recommendations that are listed under item 05-4 and the items that have been brought to the Committee already are not just beneficial to the older drivers and pedestrians but they are beneficial for all of us. It is recommended that the cones, tubular markers, vertical panels, type I, II and III barricades and delineation devices used in work zones be larger and brighter. The proposed different sizes have been included in the agenda packet.

Ken further added that California is on the leading edge. The California Senate has passed legislation for the safety area and it says "Roadway safety improvements for older drivers and pedestrians." For each of the physical years of 2005-2009, \$23.5 million is authorized for appropriation under the highway trust fund for projects related to older driver and pedestrians. This is an area that could really make a big impact if the Committee act on it now. There might be financial impact to implement these recommendations, however, he imposed a question to contractors and asked for their honest opinions. Safety was the top priority for everyone. He stated that these devices will also save time for contractors because the higher devices would be heavier, it would be harder to knock over and also they would easier to see.

Chairman Fisher asked Committee members if they had any questions for Ken.

Jacob Babico asked that the proposal does not address the daytime use of these devices. Why is there a need for reflectors for daytime use? Secondly, why is the proposal going from shall to should?

Chairman Fisher stated that the current guideline allows jurisdictions to use different sizes and there are reasons for that, such as speeds, rural/urban roadways and the type of facility.

Gerry Meis stated that the Committee may consider deferring this item until the financial impact and other issues such as inventory, equipment for placement and storage extra can be addressed.

Jacob stated that the local agencies are the one who will have to pay for this. There is also a conflict with the wording and the height.

Farhad Mansourian stated that the proponent should revisit the language and the Committee should consider having a separate meeting for this subject.

Jacob Babico and Hamid Bahadori agreed to have a separate meeting to address this topic.

Chairman Fisher stated that it is a good idea to discuss the issue in a workshop. However, the CTCDC is a group of only eight persons and the proposed changes cover a wide range of traffic control issues. In his opinion, the Committee might not have the expertise to make decisions on the various issues. At the national level, these items will be discussed by numerous committees involving over 200 persons before reaching the FHWA. He asked Ken to find out the status of these items with the FHWA and when they might be incorporated into the MUTCD.

Ken responded that he will follow-up with FHWA. Ken also requested some time to put all the items together for the Committees' review and discussion.

Note: The workshop to discuss items related to the OCTSTF will be held a day prior to the first CTCDC meeting of 2006. The date will be determined during the November 17, 2005 meeting.

05-G Overhead Pedestrian/School Crosswalk Signing with Yellow Flashing Beacons

Chairman Fisher asked Jacob Babico to address agenda item 05-G, Overhead Pedestrian/School Crosswalk signing with yellow flashing beacons.

Jacob stated that after the adoption of the MUTCD 2003 and California Supplement, the school crosswalk sign required assembly B that is supplemented with a 45-degree downward arrow pointing towards the crosswalk. There are numerous locations which has overhead school crossing or pedestrian signs supplemented with yellow flashing beacons. In that condition, assembly B would not be an appropriate installation, instead a downward overhead arrow would be an appropriate installation. In the agenda packet, page 20 of 60 has two proposals, assembly E and F to deal with this type of condition. He added that the straight downward arrow as shown in assembly E would be confusing if the roadway have multiple lanes. Assembly F may be workable, however, he is not sure if one sign would be acceptable for multilane approaches.

Chairman Fisher suggested that he recommend adopting assembly F for overhead signs because it has two 45-degree arrows pointing outward to the crosswalk. The assembly E, straight downward arrow has been used for lane assignments, and that could create confusion to the motorist if used for the overhead pedestrian signs.

Jacob asked that if a roadway have multiple lanes, in that case, is there a need for multiple signs.

Farhad Mansourian stated the downward arrows cover the whole crosswalk, so no, there's no need for multiple signs.

Hamid Bahadori added that some overhead signs have a very short mast-arm on multilane highways. The message of a single sign on a short mast-arm to the motorist is that the pedestrian could be present in the crosswalk. If the committee considers installing multiple signs to cover all lanes, in that case, some jurisdictions would have to install longer mast-arms, which may not be economically feasible for some agencies.

Chairman Fisher further added that in his opinion the overhead sign is for better visibility instead of side signs, and that the two downward arrows mean pedestrians might be present in the crosswalk.

Farhad agreed with Chairman Fisher Comments.

Chairman asked comments from audiences. There were none.

Motion: Moved by Farhad Mansourian, seconded by John Fisher to consider a new school advance warning assembly (S1-1) with supplemental double down diagonal arrows as shown in assembly F on page 20 of 60 of the agenda packet. The text and drawing should reflect the use of the assembly. The other proposed alternative assembly E was rejected.

Chairman Fisher asked for discussion on the motion.

Roger Bazeley agreed with the proposed motion and supported the adoption. He further talked about lateral crosswalks and bigger signs for pedestrian and for school zones.

Motion Carried 8-0.

Action: Caltrans will revise Section 7B.09 as recommended by the Committee.

03-3 Tsunami Evacuation Signing

Chairman Fisher asked Gerry Meis to introduce agenda item 03-3, Tsunami Evacuation Signing.

Gerry Meis stated this item is listed on the agenda under experimental request. However, Caltrans has written a letter to FHWA requesting interim approval for the signs, with a slight modification to the signs used by the State of Oregon. The justification for the proposal was that Oregon has used the signs since 1995 and Washington and Alaska have used some of the signs. Gerry further added that he has received a verbal message that the interim approval will be denied by FHWA. However, Caltrans would be asked to install these signs under experimentation. Caltrans is working closely with FHWA and the National Weather Service. Gerry Meis introduced Nancy Dean from NWSC and Robert Anderson from California Seismic Service Center and stated that both Nancy and Bob would like to speak on this item.

Chairman Fisher asked for comments from Committee members.

Farhad Mansourian suggested that the Committee should consider the adoption of the signs, as included in the agenda packet.

Gerry responded that the proposed signs include the symbol and verbal messages. The FHWA wants the symbol signs to go through the national review process.

Hamid Bahadori questioned the FHWA's requirement about the basis of study for these signs. How you achieve this? Don't you compare different signs and ask which one is more effective?

Chairman Fisher stated that the study could include a survey to find out what percentage of the public understands the signs. The experiment could also include a comparison between the MUTCD approved Evacuation sign with the proposed signs to find out which is more understandable.

Gerry reiterated that at this time Caltrans has requested interim approval based on experience of other states. When Caltrans receive a written response from FHWA, then the next step would be followed. There is tremendous pressure on Caltrans to adopt the signs, and Caltrans is awaiting a response from the FHWA.

Chairman Fisher asked for comments from the audience.

Nancy Dean, National Weather Services Center, stated that she has been working with Gerry Meis, Caltrans and with the FHWA Washington Office for the adoption of Oregon signs with slight modifications. The interim approval requested by Caltrans is based on the sign used by the State of Oregon, Washington and Alaska. FHWA would like to see the signs be installed under experimentation and data be collected to see whether the public understands the message. Nancy added that their Department is looking to conduct a survey with the Oregon signs to find out if people are understanding the message. The process is underway to develop a map identifying tsunami effected areas that will assist the local jurisdiction for the signing and evacuation locations.

Chairman Fisher commented that it sounds like the Department of NWS is planning to collect data to find out if signs are providing intended information to people or not. He added that in the agenda packet only sign graphics were included, however there were no text or polices for the installation. The policy will be helpful for an agency to make decisions of when and where to install these signs.

Gerry Meis stated that he does not want to dictate the installation, it will be the responsibility of local agencies based on the map identifying the tsunami effected areas.

Nancy Dean stated that their Department would work with the Office of Emergency Services to determine the locations which could be effected by the tsunami.

Bob Anderson, California Seismic Service Center, stated that there is a great need to place Tsunami signs as soon as possible. These signs are up in Oregon, Washington, and Alaska and they are working fine. The cities and counties want to put up these sign as soon as possible. There was a major tragedy in December and near miss along the West Coast in March 2005. Any delay to adopt these sign could be a disaster for the local communities. He urged the Committee to work with Caltrans and FHWA on the approval of tsunami signs. The Committee gives approval to Caltrans in an event the FHWA authorizes experimental approval. In that case, Caltrans do not have to come back and ask for the Committee's approval. There will be a pilot program to test these signs if needed. Bob added that the Office of Emergency Services would be responsible for identifying the locations of the signs.

Farhad Mansourian commented that the Office of Emergency Services Center would work with local agency Public Works Departments or with the Department of Transportation to identify the areas which will be effected by tsunami. It will be the responsibility of a local agency to then identify the route and placement of signs to evacuate people from point A to point B. He further added that not every community next to the coast is under the tsunami zone.

Bob Anderson stated that tsunami annotation map would be used to identify the areas for the signing purpose.

Chairman Fisher asked for other comments.

Hamid Bahadori stated that page 22 of 60, Tsunami Hazard sign has a "comma" after the word "go", and usually commas are not used on message signs.

Gerry Meis responded that would be corrected.

Matt Schmitz stated that he believes there is an urgency to adopt tsunami related signs due to the recent tsunami activities in the Asian Ocean and a recent earthquake in the West Coast of Northern California. He suggested following the MUTCD process for the installation and he is sure that it could be expedited. He reminded us that these signs are critical and should be adopted as soon as possible. However, every request is critical for any sign/traffic control device. By following the process of a new traffic control device, we can preserve the entity of the process and this could be achieved by expedited ways. This will also urge others to follow the proper process.

Farhad asked Matt what action he suggests the Committee should take to expedite the federal process.

Matt suggested that a resolution from the Committee outlining the urgency for the adoption of tsunami signs would be an appropriate approach.

Chairman Fisher asked for any other comments.

Roger Bazeley briefly talked about the signs and stated that the Committee should move ahead and adopt these signs because there is a need. He overall supported the sign graphics.

There were no other comments.

Motion: Moved by Farhad Mansourian, seconded by Gerry Meis, authorized Caltrans to proceed with an experiment with expected approval from FHWA.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Caltrans will keep the Committee informed.

05-5 Proposal for Experimentation Use of a Nonstandard Signage for Neighborhood Electric Vehicles (NEV).

Chairman Fisher asked Gerry Meis to introduce item 05-5 experiment with Signage for Neighborhood Electric Vehicle (NEV) requested by the City of Lincoln.

Gerry introduced Carl Walker, City of Lincoln and asked him to present his experiment proposal to the Committee.

Carl Walker, City of Lincoln, stated that the City of Lincoln and City of Rockln are 6 months into a five-year pilot program for NEV travel within the city. The five-year trial is a result of AB2353 which became law as of January 1, 2005. Carl explained about NEVs and how they differ from golf carts. NEV is a compact vehicle, one to four passenger vehicles powered by rechargeable batteries and an electric motor. NEV are classified as a "low speed vehicle" (LSV) under Title 49 C.F.R Part 571.500. Because NEVs are classified as LSVs, they must meet all safety standards such as seat belts, brake lights, rear lights, headlights, mirrors and windshield. NEVs must comply with all the rules and regulations for a motor vehicle as set for in the California Vehicle Code. NEVs must be registered with the State Department of Motor Vehicles and the driver must hold a valid California driver's license and be insured. NEVs may travel on any street with a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour or less. NEVs may cross state-highways at controlled intersections only. Golf carts are designed to carry golf equipment and not more than two persons, including the driver. Golf carts are not required to possess the safety equipment required of a low speed vehicle and have a top speed 15-mph. State law prohibits use of golf carts on public roadways outside of a "Golf Cart Transportation Plan".

Carl also pointed out a PowerPoint slide containing the specifications of the NEV. Carl added that the benefits of NEV uses are for short distance at low speeds where traffic, parking and air pollution might be of concern. NEV can travel 150 miles per gallon and it supports local businesses. NEV can reduce personal travel cost and provide mobility for people who cannot drive an automobile. A critical element of the NEV Transportation Plan includes the development of special paving, road markings, signage and striping for NEV travel lanes. Carl added that there are currently no State or Federal standards for NEV lane widths. The City of Lincoln's goal is to provide a safe NEV lane width without the lane being so wide that it encourages automobile use.

Carl also discussed different alternatives for NEV travel lanes, such as Class I NEV lanes, Class II NEV lanes and Class III NEV routes. Class II NEV lanes would be a portion of public roadways that are designated by signs and pavement markings for NEV travel. Class III NEV routes are mixed with traffic on most streets posted 35 mph or less. Carl also discussed different striping patterns which he shares with the Committee members by a Power Point Presentation. Carl also showed a proposed new symbol for the NEV, however he informed the Committee that the City will approach FHWA for symbol approval. In closing, Carl stated that the State of California would benefit from to the City of Lincoln's experience in implementing an NEV transportation plan. The City will identify the hurdles that will be encountered during the implementation of the NEV plan.

Chairman Fisher stated that the presentation showed marking and striping in addition to the signage. However the proposal in the agenda packet only talked about signs.

Carl responded that the City does not have the complete package for application submittal.

Farhad Mansourian stated that the proposed signage does not cover under Section 1A.3 which was recommended to include in the California Supplement earlier by the Committee.

Gerry Meis responded no, the earlier recommendation allows addition of date, extra timing, not to create a verbal message sign.

Hamid Bahadori stated that a golf cart is allowed on roadways with 25 mph or less speeds, so why is there a need to create new signs and striping.

Carl responded that the NEV could operate on roadways with speeds up to 35 mph. The purpose of a separate lane is that if a roadway has a speed higher than 35 mph, then the NEV will have their own travel lane.

Hamid asked whether the City would collect data to determine if NEVs are acceptable to travel on roadways having speeds over 35 mph as long as they have their own travel lanes.

Carl responded that AB2353 allows NEVs on roadways with speeds over 35 mph as long as there is proper signing, striping and a separate travel lane.

Chairman Fisher asked about the Vehicle Code allowing the establishment of separate bus lanes, bicycle lanes, then does this legislation allow the development of separate NEV lanes.

Carl responded yes.

Jacob Babico asked about the sign specification shown on page 32 of 60 shows "NEV Lane", in his opinion the sign should be "NEV Route".

Carl responded that is correct, it should be "NEV Route".

Chairman Fisher suggested that "NEV Route" sign should be "White on Green".

Hamid added that the request is also for authorization of new pattern of striping.

Gerry Meis added that he was not aware if there would be a request for a marking and striping approval.

Chairman Fisher asked any other comments from the audience and from Committee members.

Roger Bazeley stated that if the proposal is proven to be successful, then it could be expanded throughout California.

Motion: Moved by Farhad Mansourian, seconded by John Fisher, to authorize experimentation with the signage package with the change of "NEV Lane" to "NEV Route" with the use of existing striping details available. Experiment will be conducted on Class II NEV Routes.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Item approved for experimentation.

05-6 Experiment with #399 Motorist Aid Freeway Signing

Chairman Fisher asked Gerry Meis to introduce agenda item 05-6, experiment with #399 signing. Gerry introduced Ken Coleman to the Committee and asked him to present the proposal to the Committee.

Ken Coleman, Program Manager LA SAFE, stated that Los Angeles County SAFE is requesting on behalf of all California SAFEs, approval of a new statewide advisory sign which can be used in place of the current "Emergency - Call 9-1-1" signs to inform motorists of the new non-emergency motorist aid number/service - #399. This new sign will only be used in counties/regions that have implemented a #399 program and will allow but not require the replacement of the existing 9-1-1 advisory signs with a new sign that incorporates both numbers and/or the potential installation of the new signs on freeways. Ken added that the pictures of the proposed sign design were included in the agenda packet. Ken stated that the purpose of this new signs is to advise motorists of the availability of #399 number in non-emergency conditions. This sign is a part of the overall marketing plan to inform motorists of the service. The marketing plan includes print media ads, radio spots, billboards, media/press events and other associated activities designed to introduce the new service to the motorists.

Ken stated that in 1990, the Los Angeles County Kenneth Hahn Call Box System averaged approximately 100,000, 9-1-1 calls per month and cellular averaged 10,000, 9-1-1 calls per month. Today, call box calls in Los Angeles County average less than 10,000 calls per month and cellular increased to over 200,000, 9-1-1 calls per month. This dynamic, of decreased call box usage and increased cellular 9-1-1 calls, is not just specific to Los Angeles County, but is repeated throughout the state and helps to emphasize that wireless phones have become a standard item for most motorists because they are relatively inexpensive, small, transportable and easy to use. Ken asked for approval of the sign and stated that they will collect data and submit it to the Committee.

Chairman Fisher asked for comments from Committee members.

Hamid Bahadori stated that it might be a good idea, however the proposal is for the limited area, which does not cover all of Caltrans District 7. Secondly, the sign information is incomplete, there should be a sign with message that #399 service ended.

Ken responded that the end service sign should be a part of the package. He further added that other jurisdictions would follow-up, such as Orange County would participate in the program in September of 2005, San Diego County in January of 2006 and then the San Bernardino County would follow.

Gerry Meis asked what is the motivation behind this program.

Ken responded that SAFE is a government run program and there are dedicated funds for this program. Secondly, to many non-emergency calls goes to 9-1-1, which can be handled by this program and real emergency call will go to 9-1-1 and will get the proper attention.

Chairman Fisher asked why use #399, why not just use 399.

Ken responded that there is a technical issue tide with #.

Lenley Ducan stated that the message "motorist aid" may create confusion and secondly this is an advertisement campaign. Furthermore, the Southern CHP Office is not in agreement with the proposal.

Ken responded that they have been in contact with the Southern CHP Office, and they had some concerns that were addressed and now they are supportive of the program.

Hamid reiterated that the program is for a limited area and does not make a whole lot of sense unless the neighboring counties also join the program.

Chairman Fisher stated that as Ken mentioned, Orange County would participate in September of 2005, San Diego in January of 2006 and then San Bernardino County would follow. Just in LA and Orange counties alone have a 10 million population.

Farhad Mansourian observed that the Committee needs more information and some issues need to be resolved before the Committee can take action. He asked Ken to bring the support from the Southern CHP Office, and make changes to the signs as suggested by Lenley Duncan and Hamid Bahadori. In addition, by the next meeting, Orange County as you mentioned should be participating. He suggested for Ken to address the Committee members' concerns and bring it back for the next meeting.

Chairman Fisher asked Ken if he is willing to come back with additional information as suggested by the Committee members.

Ken responds yes, he will.

Action: Contact Ken Coleman before placing this item on the next CTCDC meeting agenda.

05-7 Proposal for Experimental Use of a Non-Standard Traffic Control Device - Automated Flagger

Chairman Fisher asked Farhad Mansourian to introduce agenda item 05-7.

Farhad asked Kevin Taber, County of Placer, to present his proposal.

Kevin Taber, Public Works Manager, Road Division, County of Placer stated that they want to use First Call Flagger (FCF) as a non standard traffic control device to determine the effectiveness in improving safety in temporary traffic control areas. Placer County would use this device on various two-lane county roads throughout Placer County. Kevin informed the Committee there was an interim approval issued by the FHWA on this device.

Chairman Fisher asked for comments from the Committee members.

Farhad Mansourian asked how many locations are planning to use this device.

Kevin responded that approximately twenty locations throughout the County.

Kevin asked Bret Goss, Vendor, whether he would like to add anything.

Bret stated that three years ago he came to the Committee and offered assistance if any public agency wanted to experiment with FCF. Now, FHWA has issued interim approval with guidelines indicating the types of features need to be involved. He added that his device is used at a number of locations in the State of Oregon, Washington and Idaho.

Gerry Meis stated that if the FHWA have issued interim approval, then the public agency could get approval from the FHWA by writing a letter saying that they wish to use this device. Basically, you do not need any approval from this Committee.

Farhad stated that even though the County does not need approval from the Committee, if the Committee authorizes experimentation, the data submitted by the County would be helpful in making the final decision on this device whether to adopt it in California or not.

Committee members agreed with Farhad's suggestion, and there were no other comments.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Farhad Mansourian, to authorize Placer County to use AFAD system as requested, subject to the letter written to the FHWA.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Item approved for experimentation.

04-E Combining of the MUTCD 2003 & CA Supplement to a Single Document

Gerry Meis informed the Committee that Johnny Bhullar has been working on this task. However, he has been on vacation until August 3, 2005. When he reports back, Caltrans will provide an update via e-mail regarding when to have a workshop to discuss comments and pending issues in regards to the combining of the MUTCD 2003 and California Supplement to a single document.

Information Items

05-8 Revised Interim Approval by the FHWA for the Use of Automated Flagger Assistance Devices in Temporary Traffic Control Zones

Committee stated that when a device is approved by the FHWA as an interim basis, any agency could receive approval to use that device by simply writing a letter to the FHWA. The Committee will wait for the final ruling on this device by FHWA before taking action for California.

05-9 Older California Traffic Safety Task Force proposed to amend MUTCD Sections 2D.38 (Street Name Sign, D3-1), 2B.34 (Do Not Enter Sign R5-1), 2B.35 (Wrong Way Sign R5-1a) and 3B.01 (Yellow Centerline Pavement Markings and Warrants)

The information was provided to Committee members for their review, because the item will be placed under “action items” during the upcoming meeting. However, the Committee has decided to have a workshop with the Task Force to discuss their items so they can look at the overall picture of these recommendations.

05-10 Proposal for the Watershed Boundary Signs

Chairman Fisher stated that item 05-10 is a information item and invited the City of San Diego Water District to present their proposal.

Mark Stone, Deputy Director, San Diego Water District, stated that he and Tedi Jackson, Public Information, will be going over a PowerPoint Presentation to share their views about the watershed signs. The City of San Diego Water Department is requesting approval of a new advisory sign that will inform motorists that they are traveling through a watershed area. The initial request is for a pilot program that will place six signs along state highways where they cross into the watersheds of the San Diego River or the San Dieguito River, both are in the metropolitan San Diego area. Ultimately, the use of the standard watershed boundary sign may be expanded throughout Southern California or throughout the state. The benefit from the program will be to meet the water pollution prevention goals. It would supplement the United States Environmental Protection Act efforts to increase awareness and education of the importance of preserving our natural resources. The program will create uniform sign design throughout the state. It will inform people that they are entering the watershed boundary, therefore do not trash or pollute on the roadways. The signs will also inform people that they are leaving the watershed boundary.

Mark stated that at this time there is no current design standard for watershed signs and they have contacted Caltrans District 11 Office on this issue. Presently, there are signs in Northern California which are not appropriate for Southern California. Mark also mentioned about the number of letters received in support of the program. Mark asked the Committee to place their request on the next CTCDC meeting under the action items, and they will work with Caltrans local office to develop a standard sign

Chairman Fisher asked for comments from Committee members.

Gerry Meis stated that he believes this is not a traffic control device and therefore the Committee has no role in developing standard signage for the watershed boundaries.

Farhad Mansourian questioned that what is the difference between this proposal and the sign on I-5 that says "Angles National Forest Area."

Gerry Meis responded that the meaning of Angles National Forest Area is that a motorist is passing through the Los Angeles Forest and it could be found on an AAA Map.

There was discussion amongst Committee members in regards to if this is a traffic control device or not. Some members argued that this is similar to signs like Mojave River or any other information signs.

Chairman Fisher asked Committee members to raise their hand if they believe this is a traffic control device. There were only four members who believe this is traffic control device. Chairman Fisher asked Committee members if they agreed to place this item as a discussion item for the upcoming meeting. There was unanimous decision to place it under the discussion items. Chairman Fisher asked the City of San Diego Water District if they could have support for the proposed signage from Statewide Water Districts and that it may be helpful in making a decision.

Next Meeting: The next meeting is scheduled for November 17, 2005 in Caltrans District 7 Office. There will be a workshop on November 16 and possibly a half-day on November 15 to discuss the combining of the MUTCD 2003 and California Supplement to a single document.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 4 PM.